UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,902	08/17/2006	Takaji Wakita	1254-0321PUS1	2324
2292 7590 09/16/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 EALL S CHUIDCH, MA 22040, 0747			EXAMINER	
			LUCAS, ZACHARIAH	
FALLS CHURG	FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/16/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commence	10/589,902	WAKITA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Zachariah Lucas	1648					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Au	igust 2006						
,— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
·— · · ·	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:							
1 apor 110(0) man bato							

Art Unit: 1648

DETAILED ACTION

REQUIREMENT FOR UNITY OF INVENTION

1. As provided in 37 CFR 1.475(a), a national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention"). Where a group of inventions is claimed in a national stage application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

The determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim. See 37 CFR 1.475(e).

When Claims Are Directed to Multiple Categories of Inventions:

As provided in 37 CFR 1.475(b), a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:

- (1)A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
- (2)A product and process of use of said product; or
- (3)A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or
- (4)A process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or
- (5)A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.

Otherwise, unity of invention might not be present. See 37 CFR 1.475(c).

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-11 and 22, drawn to an HCV genotype 2a replicon, a cell comprising such, and a first method of use.

Art Unit: 1648

Group II, claim(s) 12-15, 17, 23, and 24 drawn to a Hepatitis C virus and a cell comprising such, and a first method of making and using the virus.

Group III, claim(s) 16, drawn to a method for screening for an anti-hepatitis C virus substance comprising the use of a cell comprising the replicon particle or an HCV infected cell.

Group IV, claim(s) 18, drawn to a method of producing an HCV vaccine comprising the use of a viral particle.

Group V, claim(s) 19 and 20, drawn to a hepatotropic virus vector and a first method of making such.

Group VI, claim(s) 21, drawn to a method for replicating or expressing a foreign gene in a cell comprising the use of the replicon of Group I.

Group VII, claim(s) 25, drawn to methods for producing a virus vector comprising a foreign gene.

Group VIII, claim(s) 26, drawn to an antibody against an HCV 2a viral particle.

- 3. The inventions listed as Groups I-VIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the common technical feature of these Groups is that they are drawn to HCV 2a viral particles, nucleotides encoding such, or antibodies against such. Hadlock et al. (J Virol 74:10407-16) teaches antibodies that recognize HCV 2a viral particles, Kato et al. (J Med Virol 64:334-39) teaches a composition comprising an HCV 2a particle (page 336, right column) and the isolation of the genome thereof. In addition, it is also noted that several of the Groups relate specifically to a full-length HCV 2a replicon. Kato et al. (Gastroenterol 125:1808-17- of record in the March 2007 IDS) teaches a subgenomic HCV 2a replicon. However, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art to have produced a full length replicon from the teachings of the reference demonstrating the replication capability of the subgenomic RNA. The claimed inventions therefore lack a common special technical feature over the prior art.
- 4. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Art Unit: 1648

The species are as follows:

If Group I above is elected, Applicant is further required to elect:

- one of a selectable marker gene (claims 2 and 5), a reporter gene (claim 2), or both

(claim 2); and

- one of the cells of claim 10.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims

shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify

the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An

argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive

unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of

claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise require all the

limitations of an allowed generic claim.

The following claim(s) are generic: claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11 and 22.

5. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT

Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special

technical features for the following reasons: the species lack a common.

Conclusion

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an

election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed

(37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To

preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

Art Unit: 1648

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

- 7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 8. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be

Art Unit: 1648

amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so**may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachariah Lucas whose telephone number is (571)272-0905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on 571-272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Zachariah Lucas/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1648